REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Examiner's Action mailed July 12, 2006. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the comments set forth below.

By this Amendment, the specification is amended to correct typographical errors and claims 1-9, and 11-19 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-9 and 11-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for the reasons set forth in paragraph 2 spanning pages 2-4 of the Action. The foregoing amendments to the claims adopts the Examiner's suggestion regarding the first and second documents and addresses other areas that were considered as lacking sufficient antecedent basis, or as being indefinite for reciting alternative language (e.g., "or"). Accordingly, it respectfully submitted that claims 1-9 and 11-19 are fully definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because, in the Examiner's opinion, "the claims fail[ed] to perform a useful result because no result is claimed of the relevance calculations," and the tangible result of "the claimed invention must [be] a practical application or real world result." As set forth in MPEP 2107.01, a claimed invention must be statutory subject matter (e.g., a machine - evaluation apparatus of claim 1, or a process - evaluation method of claim 11) and be "useful" for some purpose either explicitly or implicitly. Independent claims 1 and 11 of the present invention are "useful" because the significance of the named entities is judged based on the evaluation

value. Therefore, the claimed invention establishes a specific, substantial and credible utility and produces a practical application or real world result. Accordingly, it is submitted that the claimed invention meets the two-prong test described in the MPEP as being statutory subject matter and "useful". Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 5-12 and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0101415 to Chang for the reasons set forth in the paragraph 6 spanning pages 6-11 of the Action. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Chang is directed to a method of summarizing markup-type documents automatically using structural characteristics (e.g., tag, page depth, category) of the document provided on-line. According to paragraphs [0065-0066] of Chang, a weight for each tag, page depth, and/or category is established for the mark-up **document**. Referring to Figure 3 of Chang, a higher category class is given a higher weight (i.e., C1 is the highest class and it weight is a '1.0', while C4 is the lowest category class and its weight is 0.7). Nowhere does Chang disclose an evaluation apparatus or method of named entities where the significance of the named entities is judged based on the evaluation value by using a **plurality of documents**, as required by independent claims 1 and 11.

Instead, Chang discloses a method of summarizing a markup-type document in a single document tree or a single web site. Chang discloses that weights are calculated for each element constructing a document in paragraph [0079]. Paragraph [0076] of Chang discloses a single document being extracted based on a keyword search. The single

document is then summarized following steps S5-S17 of Chang. Figure 6 of Chang illustrates a tree structure of a markup-type document composed by HTML. Then, weights for respective tags and category classes are applied to the markup-type document being summarized. The given weights are multiplied (paragraph [0079] and shown in Figures 7A-C of Chang). The elements of Chang having orders higher than the calculated weight are primarily arranged to generate the summary document from the contents of the respective elements according to an arranged order as shown in Figure 8A of Chang. That is, Chang discloses extracting a single site and summarizing markup documents in the site. This is not the claimed invention.

According to independent claims 1 and 11, an embodiment of the present invention is to judge a significance of named entities. In particular, the claimed invention detects significant named entities, for example, "key person", "key company", etc. which belong to a specific field (such as "fuel sell") from a wide area a sites or documents. The claimed invention recites that "a mutual relevance among a plurality of documents including the named entities" is defined "as an object to judge a significance". Then, according to the claimed invention, weight values of **each document** are calculated based on the relevance. Finally, an evaluation value of the named entities is calculated by carrying out the calculation process using the weight value of the each document so that the significance of the named entities is judged based on the evaluation value. Therefore, according to the embodiment of the invention in claims 1 and 11, the significance of the named entities is judged using the mutual relevance among a plurality of documents including same named entities. The plurality of documents according the invention sometimes belong to a single site and sometimes belong to a plurality of sites.

Claims 1 and 11 also recite that "documents having less mutual relation are given the higher weight value". Chang does not disclose a mutual relevance among a plurality of documents and thus, Chang cannot disclose the above feature of the claims. That is, Chang discloses tags or categories belonging to a single site or document. If a plurality of documents belong to a single site, the documents have much mutual relevance and thus, according to claims 1 and 11, the documents are given a low weight value. On the other hand, if the documents belong to a plurality of sites, the documents have less mutual relevance and the documents are given the higher weight value. Chang also fails to disclose this feature.

Consequently, the recited invention of claims 1 and 11 is fundamentally different from Chang, as Chang simply summarizes markup type documents in a single document tree or single web site. Chang does not disclose each and every feature of the claims. Claims 2-10 and 12-20 depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively. Consequently, Chang cannot anticipate claims 1-2, 5-12 and 15-20 and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-4 and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,138,113 to Dean et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Dean") for the reasons set forth in the paragraphs spanning pages 11-14 of the Action. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As argued above, Chang does not disclose all of the recited features of the claimed invention. Chang cannot judge the significance of the named entities because Chang only focuses on the summarization of a single document. Furthermore, Chang calculates the weight for the element which includes only content between a pair of tags

to generate the summary (see paragraphs [0059], [0080] of Chang). This present claimed invention does not have these restrictions. To the contrary, the claimed invention calculates weight values of each document based on the relevance.

The secondary reference to Dean is directed to a method for identifying near duplicate pages in a hyperlinked database. Dean provides no disclosure of an evaluation apparatus or method of named entities where weight values of **each document** are calculated based on relevance whereby the documents having less mutual relevance are given the higher weight value. Consequently, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Dean with Chang as neither reference teaches the features of the claimed invention. In addition, the asserted combination would change the principle operation of the primary reference to Chang. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the two references and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance be issued indicating that claims 1-20 are allowed over the prior art of record.

Should the Examiner believe that a conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 12, 2006

Catherine M. Voorhees
Registration No. 33,074
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 344-4000
Telefax: (202) 344-8300

CMV/elw
::ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS1\793190\1